

Pursuant to Ind.Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT:

DONALD W. PAGOS
Michigan City, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:

STEVE CARTER
Attorney General of Indiana

MONIKA PREKOPA TALBOT
Deputy Attorney General
Indianapolis, Indiana

**IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA**

LARRY CONN,)	
)	
Appellant-Defendant,)	
)	
vs.)	No. 46A04-0603-CR-135
)	
STATE OF INDIANA,)	
)	
Appellee-Plaintiff.)	

APPEAL FROM THE LAPORTE CIRCUIT COURT
The Honorable Robert W. Gilmore, Jr., Judge
Cause No. 46C01-0408-FC-400

September 12, 2006

MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

KIRSCH, Chief Judge

Pursuant to a plea agreement, Larry Conn pled guilty to operating a motor vehicle after a lifetime suspension,¹ a Class C felony. On appeal, Conn challenges his enhanced sentence of seven years.

We affirm.

Conn pled guilty to Class C felony operation of a motor vehicle by a person whose privileges have been forfeited for life. At the time of Conn's sentencing, IC 35-50-2-6 stated: "A person who commits a Class C felony shall be imprisoned for a fixed term of between two (2) and eight (8) years, with the advisory sentence being four (4) years." Conn argues that the trial court erred when it imposed a seven-year sentence. He specifically contends that the maximum sentence is not justified because he is not the worst offender. Further, Conn claims that the nature of his offense does not justify a seven-year sentence because his infractions were minor and not "particularly heinous."

Sentencing decisions are within the trial court's discretion and will be reversed only upon a showing of abuse of that discretion. *Farris v. State*, 787 N.E.2d 979, 983 (Ind. Ct. App. 2003). An abuse of discretion occurs if the trial court's decision is clearly against the logic and effect of the facts and circumstances. *Hart v. State*, 829 N.E.2d 541, 543 (Ind. Ct. App. 2005). However, an appellate court's review under Indiana Appellate Rule 7(B) is extremely deferential to the trial court. *Pennington v. State*, 821 N.E.2d 899, 903 (Ind. Ct. App. 2005).

¹ See IC 9-30-10-17.

We will not revise a sentence that is authorized by statute unless it is inappropriate in light of the nature of the offense and the character of the offender. App. R. 7(B); *Hart*, 829 N.E.2d at 543. Here, the trial court found three aggravating factors: Conn's criminal history, his driving record, and the fact that he violated his bond conditions while the case was pending. The court found that the fact that Conn pled guilty as the sole mitigating factor.

All are valid aggravators, and Conn's driving record is particularly egregious. Conn has multiple driving offenses including three speeding violations, three operating while intoxicated violations, multiple violations for driving without insurance, three violations for driving without a license or while license was suspended, driving while an habitual traffic violator, and several others. Conn failed to appear on four occasions, and his driver's license was suspended thirty times in seventeen years. Conn's driving record goes far beyond the particular offenses which led to the suspension of his license for life. His record, by itself, is sufficient to justify the enhanced sentence imposed here. Conn's sentence was not inappropriate in light of the nature of the offense and the character of the offender.

Affirmed.

SHARPNACK, J., and MATHIAS, J., concur.